



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,024	07/31/2003	Gerard Chauvel	TI-35461	9347
23494 7590 07/24/2008 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265				
EXAMINER				
SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2145				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

uspto@dlmail.itg.ti.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,024

Applicant(s)

CHAUVEL ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Art Unit

2145

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 12 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-11, 13-17 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20080204
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant's claims call for putting a processor in a wait state – e.g. asleep. Applicant's newly amended independent claims (bringing up content previously rejected in dependent claim 7 and its substantive counterparts) removes the processor from a wait state by de-asserting a wait signal – the processor wakes up. Putting the phone to sleep and waking it up upon detection of a signal are all the claim requires. This is *a second processor coupled to said first processor where said wait unit de-asserts the wait signal upon detection of a signal from said second processor*. Applicant made no further amendments or arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-17, and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter et al. (US 6,194,940) in view of Clark et al. (US 6,519,707).
5. In regard to claim 1, Hunter disclosed a clock system using a wait-for-interrupt mode which combines the information of a current clock register and a previous status of a clock register for use in power saving mechanisms when a phone is in "sleep mode". Hunter, column 1, lines 24-35; column 3, lines 11-59; column 6, lines 8-27. Hunter further disclosed said wait unit de-asserts the wait signal upon detection of a signal from said second processor. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13. Hunter failed to explicitly disclose the use of transactions targeting a "pre-determined address", even though the status in the clock registers were "addresses" per se. Hunter showed the ability for a cell phone to be in "sleep mode" (a wait mode). Clark, in the analogous field of power control in cell phones (Clark, column 1, lines 21-33) disclosed "memory mapping" the control registers to various specified memory address locations, e.g.

Art Unit: 2145

"targeting and detecting a pre-determined address". Clark, column 5, lines 6-25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Hunter with the teachings of Clark to allow for memory controlled access of addressed instructions, without incurring memory access conflicts or memory leaks.

6. In regard to claim 2, Clark further disclosed de-asserting the wait signal to permit the first processor to retrieve a status of the second processor. Clark, column 6, lines 1-27.
7. In regard to claim 3, Clark further disclosed the status includes one or more instructions that the first processor is to execute. Clark, column 6, lines 45-67.
8. In regard to claim 4, Hunter further disclosed said transaction comprises a read instruction. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-27 allowed the clock information in the status registers to be accessed.
9. In regard to claim 5, Hunter further disclosed said transaction comprises a write instruction. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-27 combined two pieces of clock information. The storing of the combined information is a write instruction.
10. In regard to claim 6, Hunter further disclosed said wait unit de-asserts the wait signal upon detection of a system interrupt signal generated by the first processor. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13.
11. In regard to claim 8, Hunter further disclosed said wait unit upon detection of said signal asserts a processor interrupt signal to the first processor if the wait signal is already de-asserted. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13.
12. Claim 9 is substantially the same as claims 1-2.
13. In regard to claim 10, Clark further disclosed a low power mode. Clark, column 4, lines 8-39.
14. Claim 11 is substantially the same as claim 6.
15. Claim 13 is substantially the same as claim 4.
16. Claim 14 is substantially the same as claim 5.
17. Claim 15 is substantially the same as claim 1.
18. Claim 16 is substantially the same as claim 4.
19. Claim 17 is substantially the same as claim 5.
20. Claim 18 is substantially the same as claim 6.

Art Unit: 2145

- 21. Claim 20 is substantially the same as claim 8.
- 22. Claim 21 is substantially the same as claim 9.
- 23. Claim 22 is substantially the same as claim 13.
- 24. Claim 23 is substantially the same as claim 14.
- 25. Claim 25 is substantially the same as claim 8.

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Examiner
Art Unit 2145

/J. R. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145